

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Winston Thompson Hooker, Sr. [winstonh5@ctc.net]
Sent: Saturday, May 27, 2006 7:38 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

04-267
RECEIVED
JUN 7 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Winston Thompson Hooker, Sr. (winstonh5@ctc.net) writes:

Email on a la carte TV.

To: Senator John McCain (R-Arizona)
Senator Ron Wyden (D-Oregon)
Mr. Kevin J. Martin, Chairman-FCC

From: Winston T. Hooker, Sr.
Cary, North Carolina

Subject: A LA CARTE TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

I recently saw Senator McCain speak on this subject yesterday on TV. This is a hot button for me and my wife.

We are both semi-retired and must downsize our living expenses. We spend considerable time watching TV. When we moved into our new condo in March 2005, we subscribed to Time-Warner cable services which included a digital recorder, local channels, network channels and cable channels but no premium movie or sports channels. In order to get the 18 TV channels that we do watch, we had to sign up for digital service, the "basic" channel group and the "standard" channel group, the "digital variety" group, a digital cable box (which includes the DVR) and a digital remote control. These various channel groups provide us with a total of 136 video channels and 46 music channel or 182 channels so I can get the 18 channels we want. That is 1011.11% more channels (I am a retired engineer) than we want. My complaint is not about inappropriate programming content for children (ours are grown). We just want to pick out the programming we want to watch and are willing to pay for those, but not for all of the marginal programming that others want us to subsidize. This includes foreign language channels, religious channels (we are Catholic), sports channels, public service channels, network channels, cartoon channels, teenager channels, etc.

If the cable networks can turn pay-per-view programs off and on for a single program for every viewer, it can just as easily set up a la carte programming (one a one-time basis and leave it alone) for every viewer. I am in the process of canceling my cable service with Time-Warner and installing a satellite dish from Dish Network. I will save very little money as Dish Network will require me to subscribe to a bundled program package that contains over 100 channels in order to get the 18 channels that I want, but I am canceling with Time-Warner out of principle. I wrote a 2-page letter to Mr. Richard D. Parsons, Chairman, Board of Directors, Time-Warner, Inc., with this same complaint on March 29, 2206. I received a 1-page letter from Mr. George Douglas, Vice President of Marketing, Time Warner Cable-Raleigh Division dated April 7, 2006. He said that "most research that I have seen in the past year shows that people with more than 200 channels only watch between 15 and 20 of them most of the time." He went on to say: "Unfortunately our company must pay the program suppliers (ESPN, CNN, MTV, etc.) for every customer we have, whether they watch the channels or not. And our programming contracts require us to deliver the programming to most of all of our customers." I work for a local law firm and have training and a number of years experience in contracts. Contracts are legal documents that are "negotiated" and agreed to by all parties. Apparently, Time Warner's attorneys are not as skilled in contract negotiations as their counterparts with the "program suppliers". I submit that Time Warner needs to get new attorneys and renegotiate their contracts. If we went to a Denny's Restaurant for a \$20 dinner and they insisted that we also purchase a \$50 bottle of wine, I would walk out. This practice of bundled channels is an outrage which needs immediate correction. "In addition to the steep rate hikes, several senators said that cable subscribers should only have to pay for channels they choose to watch. Sen. Ron Wyden (D-Ore.) compared the cable subscriber's problem with channel bundling to a hungry person who accidentally stumbles into an expensive restaurant. "Consumers want a modest meal at a modest price and they end up being forced a five-course meal," Wyden said." "The FCC will seek public comment this month on a

proposal that would require the cable industry to offer a la carte programming." "We do not believe in the long term that selling programming a la carte will be detrimental to either programmers or cable operators," Charles F. Dolan, chairman of Cablevision's board of directors, said in a statement. "On the contrary, our experience indicates a la carte will result in a more affordable service for all with more programming options." "However, Cox Communications CEO James O. Robbins said cable companies could charge a la carte for programming that costs more than \$1 per subscriber a month. Those pricier offerings, he suggested, could be placed on a separate, optional tier for consumers to pick and choose from." "AT&T, formerly SBC Communications, has also thrown its support behind the a la carte option. The company is currently upgrading its broadband network and deploying more fiber optics to be able to offer a paid TV service."

Winston T. Hooker, Sr.
418 Waterford Lake Drive
Cary, NC 27519

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 166.82.126.55
Remote IP address: 166.82.126.55

04-207

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Dianna Jackson [casaalgamarina@sbcglobal.net]
Sent: Thursday, May 25, 2006 1:29 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: CHOICE

RECEIVED
 JUN 7 2006
 Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Martin,

Thank you for co-authoring the op-ed piece in the L.A. Times. Finally, a voice of reason.

Our cable bill is now \$117 an it's all because we want HBO. So we subsidize hundreds of channels we don't want.

Thank you for your efforts to change the system. We really appreciate it.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Jackson
 Cayucos, CA

No. of Copies rec'd 0
 List ABOVE

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Onetrawlgirl@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, May 27, 2006 11:41 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Unbundle TV programming

64-207
RECEIVED
JUN 7 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Sir,

I subscribe to the top bundle from Direct TV, but only use a few of those channels, one of which is only offered in this large bundling group.....I would like to be able to pick the channels I watch only, and pay by what I watch, not for all the channels from 03 to 899! I am very unhappy about this rule, and hope this is being considered for change,

Thanks for your support,

Jean Evridge

Onetrawlgirl@aol.com

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABCDE

6/6/2006

Sandralyn Bailey

04-207

From: James Jones [jjones1241@tampabay.rr.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 8:59 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
JUN 7 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

James Jones (jjones1241@tampabay.rr.com) writes:

Chairman Martin,

WHY SHOULD I SUBSIDIZE NOT SPEAKING ENGLISH?

I'm very frustrated with the idea of subsidizing the use of "non-English" in the United States. Why should I and thousands of other cable subscribers that do NOT speak Spanish, pay for "Latino" channels that are automatically "bundled" into a cable tier? If someone wants a "Spanish" speaking show, they should pay separately for that choice. I'm willing to pay for English-speaking channels! I've sent an e-mail to my cable provider (Brighthouse) asking for a response to my question. I've also sent a letter to the local newspaper editor (Ledger). I'm sending an e-mail to you, my Congressman, and my Senator, asking for relief from this injustice, in my opinion. I'm starting a letter writing campaign for others that feel the way I do, to write their cable company, the FCC, their Congressman, and their Senator. If there is enough support, hopefully, the cable companies will change their service, or either the executive branch (FCC) or legislative branch (Congress/Senate) will mandate a change. The executive branch and legislative branch of the United States government work for Americans that are legal citizens, not the "illegal rabble" that march in American streets protesting the possibility of the government "enforcing" laws on immigration. I fully support a law that makes "English" the national language for the United States of America.

Since I noticed that you offer a "Spanish" link on your webpage, I will probably NOT receive any support for my request.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.125.9.238
Remote IP address: 70.125.9.238

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List ABOVE

Sandralyn Bailey

From: James [Jones@www.fcc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 31, 2006 8:53 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED
JUN 7 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

James (Jones) writes:

Chairman Martin,

WHY SHOULD I SUBSIDIZE NOT SPEAKING ENGLISH?

I'm very frustrated with the idea of subsidizing the use of "non-English" in the United States. Why should I and thousands of other cable subscribers that do NOT speak Spanish, pay for "Latino" channels that are automatically "bundled" into a cable tier? If someone wants a "Spanish" speaking show, they should pay separately for that choice. I'm willing to pay for English-speaking channels! I've sent an e-mail to my cable provider (Brighthouse) asking for a response to my question. I've also sent a letter to the local newspaper editor (Ledger). I'm sending an e-mail to you, my Congressman, and my Senator, asking for relief from this injustice, in my opinion. I'm starting a letter writing campaign for others that feel the way I do, to write their cable company, the FCC, their Congressman, and their Senator. If there is enough support, hopefully, the cable companies will change their service, or either the executive branch (FCC) or legislative branch (Congress/Senate) will mandate a change. The executive branch and legislative branch of the United States government work for Americans that are legal citizens, not the "illegal rabble" that march in American streets protesting the possibility of the government "enforcing" laws on immigration. I fully support a law that makes "English" the national language for the United States of America.

Since I noticed that you offer a "Spanish" link on your webpage, I will probably NOT receive any support for my request.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.125.9.238
Remote IP address: 70.125.9.238